



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/633,231	08/04/2000	Osamu Hori	195467US2SRD	1352

22850 7590 11/29/2004

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

CZEKAJ, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/633,231

Applicant(s)

HORI ET AL.

Examiner

Dave Czekaj

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 August 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

On page 14, the applicant argues that Anderson does not calculate a conversion parameter and does not describe an object region data using the conversion parameter. More specifically, the applicant argues that the changing costumes, walking, and crawling noted in Anderson does not result in obtaining a conversion parameter representing a conversion from a reference region into a specified region. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example Anderson column 6, lines 14-23. There Anderson discloses placing an actor at an initial point in the scene and then moving the actor throughout the scene. The examiner notes that movement (walking) from the initial point or reference region to the final point or specified region would yield a resultant conversion parameter. Therefore, the rejection has been maintained.

On page 15, the applicant argues that the sample location in Erdem is a node and not a reference frame. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example Erdem figures 3A-3B. There Erdem discloses using reference frames. The nodes indicated by the examiner indicate the points of the polygon which is used on the reference frame in the error reduction process. Therefore, the rejection has been maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (5986675), (hereinafter referred to as "Anderson").

Regarding claims 1, 2, 5, 6, Anderson discloses a process for creating a 3D computer animated movie or animated sequence of images. This invention allows a user to select an actor "specifying at least one of object regions as a reference object region "(Anderson: column 6, lines 11-12, wherein the actor is considered the object) and cause the actor to move along a user-defined path anywhere in a scene and perform any of a variety of actions, such as walking, crawling, and changing costumes (Anderson: column 6, lines 18-21). These actions result in "obtaining a conversion parameter (wherein the conversion parameter is the changing costumes, walking, or crawling) representing conversion from the reference object region into an object region of a target object (wherein the target object is the final location of the actor) and describing the object region data using the conversion parameter and information on the reference object region." The user also moves the actor along any arbitrary path defined by the user thus "approximating a time-series variation of the conversion parameter and describing the object region data using an approximate function parameter."

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-4 and 7-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (5986675), (hereinafter referred to as "Anderson") in view of Erdem et al. (5982909), (hereinafter referred to as "Erdem").

Regarding claims 7-10, Anderson discloses a process for creating a 3D computer animated movie or animated sequence of images. This invention allows a user to select an actor "specifying at least one of object regions as a reference object region "(Anderson: column 6, lines 11-12, wherein the actor is considered the object) and cause the actor to move along a user-defined path anywhere in a scene and perform any of a variety of actions, such as walking, crawling, and changing costumes (Anderson: column 6, lines 18-21). These actions result in "obtaining a conversion parameter (wherein the conversion parameter is the changing costumes, walking, or crawling) representing conversion from the reference object region into an object region of a target object (wherein the target object is the final location of the actor) and describing the object region data using the conversion parameter and information on the reference object region." The user also moves the actor along any arbitrary path defined by the user thus "approximating a time-series variation of the conversion

parameter and describing the object region data using an approximate function parameter.” However, this process lacks the error minimization as claimed. Erdem teaches that the optimum locations for nodes inside an object are found using a logarithmic method that reduces the computational load, especially when sub-pixel accuracy is applied (Erdem: column 12, lines 6-8). Erdem further discloses a step that minimizes prediction error (Erdem: column 12, lines 31-37, and figure 13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the process disclosed by Anderson and add the error minimization step taught by Erdem in order to obtain an object-region-data apparatus that keeps errors at a minimum level and produces an accurate picture.

Regarding claims 3-4, Anderson discloses that after selecting the actor and scene, the user begins to record a movie that consists of a computer-animated sequence of images (Anderson: column 11, lines 1-3). Although not stated, these images could consist of bit-map information (Official Notice) because they are popular image formats.

Regarding claims 11-14, Anderson discloses a series of frames that make up a running sequence (Anderson: figure 13). The “reference object region” is located in the center, with frames preceding and following the “reference object region”.

Regarding claims 15-18, note Erdem, figures 2A and 2B. If the threshold was exceeded in item 26a, the "reference object region is updated" via items 30b, 40b, and 50b.

Regarding claims 19-22, note Erdem, figures 2A and 2B. If the threshold was exceeded, the "conversion parameters are recursively obtained" via the arrow between items 28a and 26a.

Regarding claims 23-26, note Anderson, figure 14. The "object region is divided into a plurality of subregions" or cells from which "conversion parameters are obtained".

Regarding claims 27-30 and 33, note Anderson, figure 20. This diagram illustrates or describes "related information related to the object region of said target object".

Regarding claim 31, note Anderson, figure 1. The RAM (item 17) has a plurality of "data regions" (items 37a-37n) for storing a variety of information.

Regarding claims 32 and 34-36, although not shown, a processor could have been configured to set a reference object, obtain a conversion factor, describe the object region data, approximate a time series variation of the conversion parameter, and inversely convert a specified predetermined position into a position in a frame (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious to make the data acquisitions listed above more efficient. Also, see figure 14b of Erdem, which shows the selection inside for an object.

### ***Conclusion***


1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (703) 305-3418. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872 9314 for regular communications and (703) 872 9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

  
CHRIS KELLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600